



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.        | CONFIRMATION NO.       |
|---|-------------|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/660,418  | 09/10/2003  | Prabhuram Mohan      | 2950P087                   | 5834                   |
| 24628   | 7590        | 01/10/2008           |                            |                        |
| WELSH & KATZ, LTD<br>120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA<br>22ND FLOOR<br>CHICAGO, IL 60606 |             |                      | EXAMINER<br>CHEA, PHILIP J |                        |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT<br>2153           | PAPER NUMBER           |
|   |             |                      | MAIL DATE<br>01/10/2008    | DELIVERY MODE<br>PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/660,418

Applicant(s)

MOHAN ET AL.

Examiner

Philip J. Chea

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to an Amendment filed October 12, 2007. Claims 1-33 are currently pending. Any rejection not set forth below has been overcome by the current Amendment.

#### *Claim Objections*

1. Claims 20-21 are objected to because of the following informalities: Does the applicant intend claims 20-21 to be dependent on claim 19 not claim 1? Otherwise there is an antecedent basis problem regarding the first and second embedded applications. Appropriate correction is required.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-4, 10-13, 30, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA), and further in view of Refsnes Data ("HTML Links").

As per claims 1, 10, 30, 32, AAPA discloses a first application associated with a first Internet domain (see Fig. 1, where first application [12] is associated to first Internet domain [18]);

a second application associated with a second Internet domain (see Fig. 1, where second application [16] is associated with a second internet domain [26]).

Although the system disclosed by AAPA shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose embedding data in an anchor portion of a URL string that identifies a second Internet domain that is different from the first Internet domain; communicating the URL string to a second application associated with the second Internet domain; and at the second application, receiving the URL string and extracting the data therefrom, wherein the receiving of the URL string at the second

application does not cause the second application to perform a server access to a server associated with the second domain.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by AAPA, as evidenced by Refsnes.

In an analogous art, Refsnes discloses the use of HTML Links and that an HTML URL anchor can point to any resource on the Web (see page 1, "The Anchor Tag and Href Attribute"). Further showing how the anchor tag can create a link that can jump directly into a specified section on a page (see page 2, "The Anchor Tag and Name Attribute"). At the time of the invention, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify AAPA in a way that would allow embedding data in an anchor portion of a URL string that identifies a second Internet domain that is different from the first Internet domain (i.e. Refsnes teaches that an anchor can point to any resource on the Web). For example, it would be obvious that AAPA Fig. 1 Browser Instance A [12] could have a link to Domain X [26]. Furthermore, it is old and well known that copy and paste option could be used to copy the link to Domain X from Browser Instance A [12] and paste into the Browser Instance X [16]. Once received at Browser Instance X (i.e. second application), it is implied that the URL is received and extracted once placed into the address bar. Finally, since the URL reference is an anchor to Domain X, the browser will jump directly (i.e. does not cause the browser to perform a server access) to the portion of the HTML document referenced by the anchor link in Domain X.

Given the teaching of Refsnes, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying AAPA by employing URL anchor tages, such as disclosed by Refsnes, in order to jump directly into a specified section on a page, instead of letting the user scroll around to find what he/she is looking for.

As per claims 2,11, AAPA in view of Refsnes further disclose that the communication of the URL string is performed by a client of the first application to the second application (i.e. copy link from first application and paste to second application), and wherein both the client of the first application and the second application reside on a common machine (see APPA Fig. 1, [10]).

As per claims 3,12, AAPA in view of Refsnes further disclose that the second application communicates the data to a third application, associated with the second Internet domain, the third application communicating the data to an application server associated with the second Internet domain (see AAPA Fig. 1, [Application X], where it's obvious that the link pasted to Browser Instance X is sent to third application for retrieval of anchor tag).

As per claims 4,13, AAPA in view of Refsnes further disclose that the second application communicates the data to a client of the third application, wherein both the client of the third application and the second application reside on a common machine (see AAPA Fig. 1, where browser instance X and Application X reside both on client [10]).

4. Claims 5,14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Refsnes as applied to claims 1,10 above, and further in view of Gough (US 6,704,771).

As per claims 5,14, although the system disclosed by AAPA in view of Refsnes shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose embedding an identifier that identifies the second application within the URL string, wherein the first application invokes execution of the second application by communicating the URL string to the server associated with the second domain.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by AAPA in view of Refsnes, as evidenced by Gough.

The general concept of embedding an identifier that identifies the second application within the URL string, wherein the first application invokes execution of the second application by communicating the URL string to the server associated with the second domain is well known within the art as illustrated by Gough. Gough discloses a method including limitations for embedding an identifier that identifies the second application within the URL string, wherein the first application invokes execution of the second application by communicating the URL string to the server associated with the second domain (see claim 1, lines 2-4, which implies application programs being received over a network for execution are identified by a URL embedded in a message).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify AAPA in view of Refsnes to include the use of embedding an identifier that identifies the second application within the URL string, wherein the first application invokes execution of the second application by communicating the URL string to the server associated with the second domain as taught by Gough in order to improve upon communication via an application program, as implied in claim 1, lines 1-3 of Gough.

5. Claims 6-7, 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Refsnes as applied to claims 1, 10 above, and further in view of Risely et al. (US 6,332,158).

As per claims 6-7, 15-16, AAPA in view of Refsnes teach substantial limitations of the invention as claimed except for communicating a plurality of URL strings to the second application, each of the plurality of URL strings including further data embedded in a respective anchor portion of the URL string and periodically determining whether a new URL string has been received and, if so, extracting further data from an anchor portion of the new URL string.

The general concept of communicating a plurality of URL Strings to the second application, each of the plurality of URL strings including further data embedded in a respective anchor portion of the URL string and periodically determining whether a new URL string has been received and, if so, extracting further data from an anchor portion of the new URL string is well known within the art as illustrated by Risley et al. Risley et al discloses a method including limitations for communicating a plurality of URL strings to the second application, each of the plurality of URE strings including further data embedded in a respective anchor portion of the URL string (see spec, sec. 9, lines 53-56, which implies the domain name of a browser application being transferred to a user in association with another URL of a browser application) and periodically determining whether a new URL string has been received and, if so, extracting further data from an anchor portion of the new URL string (see spec, sec. 9, lines 53-54, which implies domain name information regarding each application being extracted only upon request for domain name information from a user in relation to a URL of a browser application).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify AAPA in view of Refsnes to include the use of communicating a plurality of URL strings to the second application, each of the plurality of URL strings including further data embedded in a respective anchor portion of the URL string and periodically determining whether a new URL string has been received and, if so, extracting further data from an anchor portion of the new URL string as taught by Risley et al in order to improve upon implementation of a domain name service system, as implied in sec. 1, lines 40-43 of Risley et al.

6. Claims 8-9, 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Resnes in view of Risely as applied to claims 7, 16 above, and further in view of Lavin (US 2004/0117376).

In reference to claims 8-9, and 17-18, AAPA and Refsnes and Risley teach substantial limitations of the invention as claimed except for the second application including client-side executable logic to determine receipt of the new URL string and embedding an identifier for the second application within the URL string, thereby to cause download of the second application from the second Internet domain. The general concept of the second application including client-side executable logic to determine receipt of the new URL string is well known within the art as illustrated by Lavin et al. Lavin et al discloses a method including limitations for the second application including client-side executable logic to determine receipt of the new URL string (see e.g. [0128], lines 22- 25, which implies polling implementations are provided to allow a data acquisition application to receive a URL string to receive application information in relation to another website domain) and embedding an identifier for the second application within the URL string, thereby to cause download of the second application from the second Internet domain (see e.g. [0145], lines 4-6, which implies data acquisition being used to download data from data sources in relation to the application information with the URL string, as shown in sec. [0128]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify AAPA and Refsnes, and Risley et al to include the use of the second application including client-side

executable logic to determine receipt of the new URL string and embedding an identifier for the second application within the URL string, thereby to cause download of the second application from the second Internet domains taught by Lavin et al in order to improve upon data acquisition throughout web domains, as implied in sec. [0073], lines 1-3 of Lavin et al.

7. Claim 19,21-26,31,33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corboy et al. (US 2002/0054139), herein referred to Corboy, and further in view of Lyons et al (US 6,484,180), herein referred to as Lyons.

As per claims 19,22,26,31,33, Corboy discloses a first embedded application, the first embedded application being embedded within a browser instance at a client device operating as a first client application; a second embedded application, the second embedded application being embedded within a second browser at the client device instance operating as a second client application; and establishing communications between the first and second embedded applications to thereby enable a communication of data between the first client application and the second client application (see paragraph 77, *describing how a first instantiation and second instantiation of a browser application contains embedded JavaScript to maintain a connection between instantiations of the browser application in order to communicate messages between the instantiations*).

Although the system disclosed by Corboy shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose downloading each respective application.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Corboy, as evidenced by Lyons.

In an analogous art, Lyons discloses a desire to download code to a receiving client in order to prepare the client for accessing domain object data (see column 12, lines 59-67).

Given the teaching of Lyons, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Corboy by employing a download of embedded applications into each respective instantiation of the client browser, such as disclosed by Lyons, in order to supply the client with code that will enable it to retrieve data objects.

In considering the first and second client applications being associated with first and second Internet domains, Corboy discloses that the first and second instantiations can be dedicated to providing different types of online services (i.e. different Internet domains) and the first instantiation can be connected to one particular server (i.e. a first Internet domain) and the second instantiation may not be able to connect to that particular server (see paragraph 78). At the time of the invention, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious for the second browser instantiation to be connected to a second domain considering it is not able to connect with the first Internet domain and it is dedicated to providing a different online service. Furthermore, it is old and well known in the art that two different browser instantiations can browse two different Internet domains.

As per claim 21, Corboy further discloses that the first and second embedded applications is any application that can communicate utilizing Java script (see paragraph 77).

As per claim 23,27, Corboy further discloses that the first client application includes a first script, the first script operationally to issue a first function call to a first functions within the first embedded application, the function call including data to be communicated to the second client application (see paragraph 77).

As per claim 24,28, Corboy further discloses that the first embedded application, responsive to the first function call from the first script, issues a second function call to the second embedded application, the second function call including the data to be communicated to the second application (see paragraph 88).

As per claim 25,29, Corboy further discloses that the second embedded application responsive to the second function call from the first embedded application, issues a third function call to a second script included within the second client application, the third function call including the data to be communicated to the second application (see paragraph 88).

8. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corboy in view of Lyons as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Zhao (US 2002/0107910).

Corboy in view of Lyons fails to disclose that each of the first and second embedded applications being any one of a Java applet, an ActiveX control, and a Visual Basic control. The general concept of each of the first and second embedded applications being any one of a Java applet, an ActiveX control, and a Visual Basic control is well known within the art as illustrated by Zhao. Zhao discloses a method including limitations for each of the first and second embedded applications being any one of a Java applet, an ActiveX control, and a Visual Basic control and each of the first (see e.g. [0029], lines 2-5, which implies each communication client implemented within the system may have multiple java script or java applet instances embedded for communication).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Corboy in view of Lyons to include the use of each of the first and second embedded applications being any one of a Java applet, an ActiveX control, and a Visual Basic control as taught by Zhao in order to improve upon communications frameworks for application servers and clients, as implied in sec. [0027], lines 1-3 of Zhao.

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip J. Chea whose telephone number is 571-272-3951. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4:00 (1st Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Application/Control Number:  
10/660,418  
Art Unit: 2153

Page 10

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Philip J Chea  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2153

PJC 12/27/07



**GLENDON B. BURGESS**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**